

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

					$I \cup I \cup I$
APPLICATION NO.	CATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,294 07/10/2000		000	Peter Hauber	BLDR-01	9656
7	7590	01/22/2004		EXAM	INER
Louis J. Bach	and		LUGO, CARLOS		
P. O. Box 1508	3				
La Canada, Ca	A 91012-550	8	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, and the second				3677	

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	
		09/613,294	HAUBER, PETER	//
Office Action Summ	ary	Examiner	Art Unit	H^{-}
		Carlos Lugo	3677	<u> </u>
The MAILING DATE of this core Period for Reply	ommunication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	\
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PER THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COI - Extensions of time may be available under the after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of - If the period for reply specified above, the mail - If NO period for reply is specified above, the mail - Failure to reply within the set or extended perio - Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.	MMUNICATION. provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 this communication. an thirty (30) days, a reply v aximum statutory period vil d for reply will, by statute, c months after the mailing of	o(a). In no event, however, may a replication of thirty (3 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH reases the application to become ABAN	to be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
1) Responsive to communicatio	n(s) filed on 09 No	<u>vember 2003</u> .		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL.	2b)∏ This a	ction is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in co closed in accordance with the				S
Disposition of Claims				
4a) Of the above claim(s) 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to	d. ed to.			
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 21 Ap Applicant may not request that a Replacement drawing sheet(s) in 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objective under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 1	oril 2003 is/are: a)[any objection to the dincluding the correction to the Example 1 or 1 o	☐ accepted or b) ☑ objecterawing(s) be held in abeyance on is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121((d) .
12) Acknowledgment is made of		priority under 35 U.S.C. §	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) All b) Some * c) No 1. Certified copies of the 2. Certified copies of the 3. Copies of the certified application from the Int * See the attached detailed Offic 13) Acknowledgment is made of a since a specific reference was 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the for 14) Acknowledgment is made of a reference was included in the for	one of: priority documents priority documents copies of the priorit ternational Bureau ce action for a list of claim for domestic included in the first eign language proviolation for domestic	have been received. have been received in Apply documents have been re (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). If the certified copies not re priority under 35 U.S.C. § sentence of the specification has been priority under 35 U.S.C. §	elication No ceived in this National Stage ceived. 119(e) (to a provisional application or in an Application Data Sh n received. § 120 and/or 121 since a specifi	ieet.
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing F 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO		5) Notice of Info	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/613,294 Page 2

Art Unit: 3677

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on November 9,
 2003.

Drawings

- 2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the 4 bar linkage (Figure 2C only show 2 bars 58 and 62) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
- 3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:
 - Elements 49 and 55 are not illustrated in the drawings.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 3,353,855 to Smith.

Regarding claim 1, Smith discloses a sliding door latch assembly. The assembly comprises a vertically extended housing (14) having a vertically disposed pull handle (136) opposite a housing locus extending over a major portion but not all of the vertical extend of the housing.

A latch (11) is mounted on the locus and shiftable to and from the housing for locking a sliding door to a cooperating keeper (32) mounted in a sliding door jamb (Figure 4) opposite the latch.

A rotary actuator (114,115,120 and 124) is located within the housing locus for shifting the latch.

A hand-operated lever (100 and 110) is rotatably mounted to the housing beyond the housing locus and being vertically spaced in a predetermined distance from the rotary actuator (Figures 1 and 3).

As to claim 2, Smith illustrates that the latch is a hook-shaped and that the cooperating keeper comprises a slot.

As to claim 3, Smith illustrates that the housing has a rectangular cross section.

6. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 3,177,687 to Tucker.

Regarding claim 1, Tucker discloses a sliding door latch assembly. The assembly comprises a vertically extended housing (11) having a vertically disposed pull handle (12 and 18) opposite a housing locus extending over a major portion but not all of the vertical extend of the housing.

A latch (36) is mounted on the locus and shiftable to and from the housing for locking a sliding door to a cooperating keeper mounted in a sliding door jamb opposite the latch.

A rotary actuator (22) is located within the housing locus for shifting the latch.

A hand-operated lever (50) is rotatably mounted to the housing beyond the housing locus and being vertically spaced in a predetermined distance from the rotary actuator (Figures 3 and 4).

As to claim 2, Tucker discloses that the latch is a hook-shaped (36) and that the cooperating keeper comprises a slot.

As to claim 3, Tucker illustrates that the housing (11) has a rectangular cross section.

As to claims 4 and 6, Tucker discloses that the lever (50) further includes a rotatable lever plate (45), wherein the lever plate and the lever are mounted to a common pivot (Figure 4).

As to claim 5, Tucker discloses that the rotary actuator further includes a rotatable latch plate (26), wherein the rotatable latch plate and rotary actuator are mounted to a common pivot (Figure 3).

As to claim 7, Tucker discloses that the sliding door latch further includes a pair of bars (30 and 32) fixed to and extending between the lever plate and the rotatable latch plate.

Application/Control Number: 09/613,294 Page 5

Art Unit: 3677

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Pat No 3,177,687 to Tucker.

Regarding claim 8, Tucker fails to disclose that the length of the bars extends

from within the housing locus to beyond the housing locus. Tucker illustrates that the

length of the bars does not extends the housing locus.

However, applicant is reminded that a change in the size of a prior art device is a

design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Rose, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ

237 (CCPA 1955).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have a pair of bars that extends the housing locus, because it

is consider a change in size that will not affect the movement of the latch.

As to claim 9, Tucker discloses that the latch is a hook-shaped (36) and that the

cooperating keeper comprises a slot.

As to claim 10. Tucker illustrates that the housing (11) has a rectangular cross

section.

As to claim 11, Tucker discloses that the pull handle (18) is an inside handle and

also includes an outside handle (12) fixed to the housing.

Art Unit: 3677

As to claim 12, Tucker illustrates that the door-sliding latch includes a leading stile that defines the housing (Figures 2-4).

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 3,177,687 to Tucker in view of US Pat No 3,413,025 to Sperry.

Tucker fails to disclose that a 4-bar coupling is used between the latch and the lever. Tucker disclose the use of a 2 bar coupling (30 and 32).

Sperry teaches that is known in the art to have a 4-bar coupling (90,92 and 94) in a door latching assembly.

Applicant is reminded that duplicating the components of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill of the art. <u>In re Harza</u>, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a 4-bar coupling, as taught by Sperry, into a latch assembly as described by Tucker, because it consider as a duplication of components that will not affect the movement of the latch.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on November 9, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's arguments that Smith fails to disclose "a housing locus that the pull handle is opposite", that "a hand-operated lever is rotatably mounted to the housing beyond the housing locus", and that "housing locus is opposite the pull handle" (Page 8 Line13), Smith discloses this limitation.

Page 7

First, the word locus means "the place where something is situated". Smith illustrates a pull handle (136) that is opposed to a housing locus or point of situation at the housing (where the handle is situated at each end). The hand-operated lever (110) is rotatably mounted to the housing beyond the housing locus or point of situation at the housing (Figure 1).

Because the applicant fails to clearly define the borders of the housing and precisely locate the housing locus or point or place where something is situated, any convenient point or place is examine. Therefore, Smith discloses the invention as claimed.

As to applicant's arguments that Tucker fails to disclose the same point as in Smith (Page 9 Line 5), the same argument presented previously to Smith is presented here. Therefore, Tucker also discloses the invention as claimed.

As to applicant's arguments that Sperry fails to disclose the main limitations of the invention (Page 10 Line 10), Sperry is only used to teaches that is known in the art to have a 4-bar coupling (90,92 and 94) in a door latching assembly. Tucker already discloses the main limitations.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 09/613,294

Art Unit: 3677

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then

Page 8

the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed,

and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the

mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period

for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Carlos Lugo whose telephone number is 703-305-

9747. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-

9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-

306-5771.

Carlos Lugo

Examiner

Art Unit 367

January 13, 2004.

WILLIAM MILLER

PRIMARY EXAMINER